

REMARKS

The Official Action dated November 19, 2003, has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herewith, taken with the following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present invention in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

~~Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the allowance of claim 30 and the~~ indication of allowance of claims 6 and 7. In view of the amendments to claim 6, Applicants believe that this claim, and its dependents, are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration.

By present amendment, claims 2-3, 6, 8, 10, 14, 19, 25, 30-31 and 33 have been amended, all of which find support in the specification and drawings as originally filed. It is believed that these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter, whereby entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5, 13 and 24 have been canceled. Claims 2-4, 6-10, 14, 19-20, 25, 30-31 and 33 remain in the case for consideration.

In the Official Action, claims 1-5, 10, 24-25, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wolters et al (U.S. Patent NO. 4,036,258). Claims 13-14 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cooper et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,744,825). Finally, claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolters et al and Fahnoe (U.S. Patent No. 3,575,683).


In lieu of the amendments to claims 2-4, 7-10, 14, 19-20, 25, 31 and 33, Applicant believes that these claims are not anticipated due to their dependency from claims indicated to have patentable subject matter (claims 6 and 30). In addition, dependent claims are nonobvious under §103 if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In light of the amendments having claims 2-4, 8-10, 14, 19-20, 25 and 31 depend from claim 6 (an indicated allowed

claim), Applicant believes that claims 2-4, 8-10, 14, 19-20, 25 and 31 are nonobvious. Furthermore, in lieu of the amendment to claim 33, having it depend from claim 30 (also an allowed claim), Applicant believes claim 33 is also nonobvious. As such, reconsideration is respectfully requested concerning claims 2-4, 7-10, 14, 19-20, 25, 31 and 33.

It is therefore submitted that the present inventive articles as set forth in claims 2-4, 10, 25, 31 and 33 are not anticipated by Wolters et al. Moreover, claims 13-14 and 19-20 are not anticipated by Coopers et al, whereby the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 have been overcome. Finally, the inventive articles, as set forth in claims 8-9 are non-obvious over and patentably distinguishable from Wolters et al in view of Fahnoe, whereby the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

It is believed that the above amendments and remarks represent a complete response to the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 placing the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Clayton L. Kuhnell
Reg. No. 48,691
Attorney for Applicants
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 E. Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8377